DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 714 TM 820 861

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Development of USES Specific Aptitude Test Battery for Waiter/Waitress, Informal (hotel & rest.) 311.477-030. |
| INSTITUTION | Oregon State Dept. of Human Resources, Salem. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | S-179R82 |
| PUB DATE | 82 |
| NOTE | 19p. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Aptitude Tests; Employment Qualifications; *Hospitality Occupations; Job Analysis; *Occupational Tests; Personnel Evaluation; Predictive Measurement; *Test Construction; Test Use; Test Validity; *Vocational Aptitude |
| IDENTIFIERS | Test Batteries; USES Specific Aptitude Test Battery; *Waiters Waitresses |

ABSTRACT

The United States Employment Service (USES) Specific Aptitude Test Battery (SATB) for Waiter/Waitress (Informal) is evaluated from three points of view: (1) technical adequacy of the research, (2) fairness to minorities, and (3) usefulness of the battery to Employment Service staff and employers in selecting individuals for training as waiter/waitress. Research demonstrated a statistically significant and useful relationship between proficiency as a waiter/waitress and the SATB. The report includes: (1) summary; (2) procedure; (3) analysis; and (4) validity of the battery. Descriptive statistics for subgroups of the validation sample; descriptive rating scale; and job description are contained in the appendices. (Author/PN)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

# Waiter/Waitress, Informal (hotel & rest.) 311.477-030

Development of USES Specific Aptitude Test Battery S-179R82

U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration
U.S. Employment Service
1982

ED223714

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TM 820 861

# DEVELOPMENT OF USES SPECIFIC APTITUDE TEST BATTERY

for

WAITER/WAITRESS, INFORMAL (hotel & rest.) 311.477-030

S-179R82

Developed in Cooperation with the
Alaska, California, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri,
Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania
Employment Services

Analysis and Report

by

State of Oregon
Department of Human Resources
Employment Division
Test Development Unit

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Employment and Training Administration
United States Employment Service

1982

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The United States Department of Labor and affiliated State Employment Security Agencies express their sincere gratitude to the following organizations for cooperating in this research.

North

Anchor Inn, Lansing, Michigan
Carl's Chop House, Detroit, Michigan
Dry Dock Inn, Southfield, Michigan
Elias Brothers, Warren, Michigan
J.L. Hudson, Detroit, Michigan
J.L. Hudson, Southfield, Michigan
La Rotisserie, Hyatt Regency, Dearborn, Michigan
Omar Restaurant, Kansas City, Missouri
Sisters Coffee House, Kansas City, Missouri
Playboy Clubs International, McAfee, New Jersey
Denny's, Binghampton, New York,
Denny's, Buffalo, New York
Denny's, Cheektowaga, New York
Denny's, Syracuse, New York
Frischs', Cincinnati, Ohio
Sambo's , Dayton, Ohio
Seafood Express, Warren, Ohio
Holiday Inn, Johnstown, Pennsylvania
Host Enterprises, Lancaster, Pennsylvania
Mr. Steak, Lancaster, Pennsylvania
Sheraton Inn, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

South

Hyatt Regency, Louisville, Kentucky
Widow Watson's, Jackson, Mississippi

West

Don & Phyllis', Ketchikan, Alaska
Sambo's, Anaheim, California
Sambo's, Inglewood, California
Sambo's, Santa Barbara, California
Sambo's, Santa Monica, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT | ii |
| SUMMARY | 1 |
| PROCEDURE | 2 |
| Job Analysis | 2 |
| Experimental Test Battery | 3 |
| Validation Sample Description | 3 |
| Criterion for Validation Study | 3 |
| Cross-Validation Sample Description | 5 |
| Criterion for Cross-Validation Study | 5 |
| ANALYSIS | 6 |
| VALIDITY OF THE BATTERY | 7 |
| Criterion Related Validity | 8 |
| Effectiveness of the Battery | 8 |
| Subgroup Analysis | 9 |
| Prior Battery | 9 |
| APPENDIX 1 | |
| Descriptive Statistics for Black and Nonminority Subgroups of Validation Sample | 11 |
| APPENDIX 2 | |
| Descriptive Rating Scale | 13 |
| APPENDIX 3 | |
| Job Description | 17 |

GATB Study No. 3074

# DEVELOPMENT OF USES SPECIFIC APTITUDE TEST BATTERY S-179R82

for

WAITER/WAITRESS, INFORMAL (hotel & rest.) 311.477-030

## SUMMARY

This report is designed to provide information required to evaluate the Specific Aptitude Test Battery (SATB) for Waiter/Waitress, Informal from three points of view (1) technical adequacy of the research, (2) fairness to minorities and (3) usefulness of the battery to Employment Service staff and employers in selecting individuals for training as Waiter/Waitress.

Research demonstrated a statistically significant and useful relationship between proficiency as a Waiter/Waitress and the following Specific Aptitude Test Battery:

| Aptitudes | Cutting Scores |
|---|---|
| N - Numerical Aptitude | 85 |
| Q - Clerical Perception | 95 |
| K - Motor Coordination | 80 |

Two samples were used in the research. The validation sample, on which the SATB was developed, consisted of 239 employed workers (including 60 blacks) from eleven states. Data were collected during 1975-1980. The tests used were the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB). Job proficiency was measured by means of ratings by the supervisors. A second sample, tested in 1959, confirmed or cross validated the SATB. This sample consisted of 60 females. The GATB was administered to this sample and supervisors independently rated the job performance of these workers.

No evidence of differences in validity for blacks and nonminorities was found. The SATB was found to be fair to both blacks and nonminorities using several definitions of fairness. Additional information may be found in the Validity of the Battery section and in Appendix 1.

The SATB can be expected to produce a useful increase in the proportion of highly competent workers. When the SATB was applied to the validation sample, composed of individuals who were employed and therefore considered proficient, an increase from 65% to 75% in the percentage of highly competent workers was found. Similar results, an increase from 67% to 76% in the percentage of highly competent workers, were found for the cross-validation sample. A greater increase can be expected when the battery is used with applicants, as the range of relevant abilities is wider among applicants than among employed workers.

## PROCEDURE

A concurrent design was used for both validation and cross-validation studies; test and criterion data were collected at about the same time. Data for the validation sample were collected during 1975-1980; cross-validation data were collected during 1959.

### Job Analysis

A job analysis was performed by observing the workers' performance on the job and by consulting with their supervisors. On the basis of the job analysis, a job description was prepared which was used to select an experimental sample of employed workers performing basically the same job duties and to choose an appropriate criterion or measure of job performance.

At each location listed in ACKNOWLEDGMENT, the job duties were compared with the job description and found to be essentially the same. If minor differences were found, the job description was modified. The job description shown in Appendix 3 is the result of this process and may be used to provide information on the applicability of the test battery resulting from this research.

In the validation sample job analysis, each job duty was rated for frequency of performance, percentage of time spent, and level of difficulty. Critical job duties were identified on the basis of these ratings.

At each location, at least one analyst rated the aptitudes as irrelevant, important, or critical to performance of the job duties. A synthesis of these ratings and the rationale for their selection follows.

| | |
|---|---|
| V - Verbal Aptitude | Required to discuss menu with manager or cook, to determine specials or changes, to greet patrons, to take orders, to make suggestions, and to respond to patron's conversation. |
| N - Numerical Aptitude | Required to calculate amount of bill including tax where applicable, to collect payment and to return correct change to patrons. |
| M - Manual Dexterity | Required to set tables, to carry and place foods and drinks quickly and precisely, and to clear dishes and to clean tables and serving areas. |

## Experimental Test Battery

The experimental test battery for the validation and cross-validation samples consisted of all 12 tests of the GATB. Information on the composition and developmental research of the GATB may be found in the Manual for the General Aptitude Test Battery, Section III, Development, available from the Government Printing Office.

## Validation Sample Description

The validation sample consisted of 239 Waiters/Waitresses (204 females and 35 males) employed in the North, South and West (see ACKNOWLEDGMENT). A total of 85 were minority group members (60 black, 7 American Indian, 10 Hispanic, 2 Oriental, and 6 "other") and 154 were nonminority group members. The means and standard deviations for age, education and experience of sample members are shown in Table 1.

Nineteen subjects were administered a test to determine whether they possessed significant arithmetic skills for the job. However, no cutting score was set for the test. All Waiters/Waitresses had at least 1 month experience on a job which has duties similar to those found in the job description in Appendix 3. Descriptive statistics for black and nonminority subgroups are shown in Appendix 1.

## Criterion for Validation Study

The criterion for the validation sample consisted of supervisory ratings. The immediate supervisor rated each worker. The ratings were obtained by means of personal visits of State test development analysts who explained the rating procedure to the supervisors. Two ratings were obtained from each supervisor with an interval of at least two weeks between the ratings. Since sample members' test scores are confidential, supervisors had no knowledge of the test scores of workers.

A descriptive rating scale was used. The scale (see Appendix 2) consists of six items. Five of these items cover different aspects of job performance. The sixth item is a global item on the "all-around" ability of the Waiter/Waitress. Each item has five alternative responses corresponding to different degrees of job proficiency. For the purpose of scoring the items, weights of 1 to 5 were assigned to the responses. The total score on the rating scale is the sum of the weights for the six items. The possible range for each rating is 6-30.

A review of the job description indicated that the subjects covered by the rating scale were directly related to important aspects of job performance.

A - Quantity of work: Waiters/Waitresses are required to be sufficiently quick and efficient to serve an acceptable number of patrons.

B - Quality of work: Waiters/Waitresses are required to meet the qualitative work standards set by management.

C - Accuracy of work: Waiters/Waitresses must meet an acceptable standard of accuracy in calculating bills, making correct change and serving patrons food as ordered.

D - Job knowledge: Waiters/Waitresses must have sufficient knowledge of their particular restaurant's procedures to perform their duties adequately.

E - Job versatility: Waiters/Waitresses must be able to perform adequately all the various duties required by the employer.

F - "All-around" job ability: Waiters'/Waitresses' value to the employer involves a combination of all of the above aspects of job performance.

A reliability coefficient of .74 was obtained between the initial ratings and the reratings, indicating a significant relationship. Therefore, the final criterion score consists of the combined scores of the two ratings. The possible range for the final criterion is 12-60. The actual range is 26-60. The mean is 45.3 with a standard deviation of 7.7. The relationship between the criterion and age, education and experience is shown in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1

Means, Standard Deviations (SD) and Pearson Product-Moment Correlations with the Criterion (r) for Age, Education and Experience

Validation Sample
N = 239

| | Mean | SD | r |
|---|---|---|---|
| Age (years) | 28.9 | 11.7 | .11 |
| Education (years) | 12.3 | 1.9 | .08 |
| Total Experience (months) | 81.6 | 100.2 | .22** |

**Significant at the .01 level

For the purpose of this analysis, the criterion distribution was dichotomized so as to include, as nearly as possible, one-third in the low criterion group and two-thirds in the high criterion group. This is the standard procedure for SATB studies. A criterion cutting score of 43 placed 35% of the total sample in the low criterion group.

Cross-Validation Sample Description

The cross-validation sample consisted of 60 Waitresses employed in Michigan during 1959. This study was conducted prior to the requirement of providing minority group information. Therefore, minority group status of the sample members is unknown. The means and standard deviations for age, education and experience of sample members are shown in Table 1a.

Criterion for Cross-Validation Study

The criterion for this study consisted of supervisory ratings based on a revision of the Descriptive Rating Scale SP-21 developed by the Bureau of Employment Security. The rating scale consisted of 11 items covering different aspects of job performance which were suggested by the restaurant owners as relevant to the occupation.

Five alternatives for each item were offered. Weights of one through five, indicating the degree of job proficiency attained, were assigned to each alternative.

The restaurant owners, who were thoroughly familiar with the work of each employee, prepared ratings and re-ratings for each worker with an interval of four to six weeks between the two sets of ratings. A correlation of .896 was obtained between the two sets of ratings. The final criterion consisted of the combined and averaged rating scale scores multiplied by ten to eliminate the decimal. The possible range of scores was 110-550, with a mean score of 445.2 and a standard deviation of 79.4.

TABLE 1a

Means, Standard Deviations (SD) and Pearson Product-Moment Correlations with the Criterion (r) for Age, Education and Experience

Cross-Validation Sample
N = 60

| | Mean | SD | r |
|---|---|---|---|
| Age (years) | 33.8 | 8.8 | .129 |
| Education (years) | 10.8 | 1.6 | .074 |
| Experience (months) | 108.7 | 88.0 | .065 |

There were no significant correlations with the criterion for age, education or experience.

## ANALYSIS

The initial step in the analysis is to identify those aptitudes which show some evidence of validity and job relatedness. This evidence can be:

1. Statistical evidence of the correlation (r) between the test and the criterion,

2. Content validity as evidenced by a rating of "critical" based on the job analysis, or

3. Any combination of the following:

   a. high mean

   b. low standard deviation (SD)

   c. rating of "important" based on the job analysis

   d. demonstrated validity in a prior validation study

Statistical results for the validation sample are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Statistical Results for Validation Sample

N = 239

| Aptitude | Mean | SD | r |
|---|---|---|---|
| G - General Learning Ability | 96.4 | 18.3 | .20 ** |
| V - Verbal Aptitude | 100.1 | 16.9 | .20 ** |
| N - Numerical Aptitude | 95.5 | 17.9 | .24 ** |
| S - Spatial Aptitude | 98.2 | 18.5 | .08 |
| P - Form Perception | 111.5 | 21.9 | .12 |
| Q - Clerical Perception | 114.2 | 17.5 | .21 ** |
| K - Motor Coordination | 107.6 | 17.4 | .20 ** |
| F - Finger Dexterity | 98.1 | 20.7 | .09 |
| M - Manual Dexterity | 108.9 | 21.4 | .13* |

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

Table 3 summarizes the qualitative analysis and statistical results shown in Table 2 and shows the aptitudes considered for inclusion in the battery.

TABLE 3

Summary of Qualitative and Quantitative Data for Validation Sample

| Type of Evidence | Aptitudes | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | G | V | N | S | P | Q | K | F | M |
| Job Analysis Ratings | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical | | | | | | | | | |
| Important | | x | x | | | | | | x |
| Irrelevant | | | | | | | | | |
| Statistical Evidence | | | | | | | | | |
| High Mean | | | | | x | x | | | x |
| Low SD | | | | | | | | | |
| Significant r | x | x | x | | | x | x | | x |
| Aptitudes Considered for Inclusion in the Battery | G | V | N | | | Q | K | | M |

The information in Table 3 indicates that the following aptitudes should be considered for inclusion in the battery: G, V, N, Q, K, and M. Although a majority of analysts did not consider aptitudes Q and K as important for this job, statistical evidence implies that they are important. A review of the job description (Appendix 3) did not contraindicate these aptitudes. The objective of the analysis is to develop a battery of 2, 3, or 4 aptitudes with cutting scores set at levels (a) where about the same percent will meet the cutting scores as the percent placed in the high criterion group and (b) which will maximize the relationship between the battery and the criterion.

The cutting scores are set at about one standard deviation below the mean aptitude scores of the sample, with the deviations at five point intervals above and below these points to achieve the objectives indicated above.

The following battery resulted:

| Aptitudes | Cutting Scores |
|---|---|
| N - Numerical Aptitude | 85 |
| Q - Clerical Perception | 95 |
| K - Motor Coordination | 80 |

## VALIDITY OF THE BATTERY

This section of the report first presents evidence of criterion-related validity of the SATB on the validation sample and all relevant sub-samples and the cross-validation sample. Next, it provides information on effectiveness and fairness of test norms.

Criterion Related Validity

Table 4 shows that there is a significant relationship between the job performance criterion and the SATB for the validation sample in aggregate and each of its identifiable ethnic subgroups and the cross validation sample.

TABLE 4

Validity of Battery

| Sample | N | High Criterion Group: Below Cutting Scores | High Criterion Group: Meeting Cutting Scores | Low Criterion Group: Below Cutting Scores | Low Criterion Group: Meeting Cutting Scores | Chi Square | Significance Level p/2< | Phi Coefficient |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Validation Total | 239 | 34 | 121 | 43 | 41 | 21.4 | .0005 | .30 |
| Black | 60 | 11 | 18 | 21 | 10 | 5.4 | .025 | .30 |
| Non-minority | 154 | 16 | 93 | 19 | 26 | 13.8 | .0005 | .30 |
| Cross-Validation | 60 | 11 | 29 | 11 | 9 | 3.2* | .05 | .23 |

*Yates' correction applied

Multiple regression analysis was conducted between aptitudes N, Q and K and the criterion. A multiple correlation of .28 was obtained, significant at the .001 level.

Effectiveness of the Battery

The level of validity shown in Table 4 indicates that the SATB will be useful in selection. In the total validation sample, 65% were considered to be highly competent. Of those who met the cutting scores, 75% were highly competent, an increase of 10 percentage points over the existing selection method. Similar results were found for the cross-validation sample. These findings are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Effectiveness of the Battery

| Selection System | Number Selected | Highly Proficient (High Criterion Group) | | Marginal (Low Criterion Group) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | % | N | % |
| Validation Sample | | | | | |
| Without Tests | 239 | 155 | 65 | 84 | 35 |
| With Tests | 162 | 121 | 75 | 41 | 25 |
| Cross-Validation Sample | | | | | |
| Without Tests | 60 | 40 | 67 | 20 | 33 |
| With Tests | 38 | 29 | 76 | 9 | 24 |

The research sample consisted of employed workers on whom some selection had already taken place; presumably those workers who lacked the required abilities had quit, been fired, or had been transferred. Therefore, a greater increase over existing selection methods in the proportion of competent workers is to be expected when the battery is used for selection, as the range of relevant abilities is almost certainly greater among applicants than among employed workers.

Subgroup Analysis

No difference in the validities for blacks and nonminorities was found for this battery; the difference between phi coefficients for black and nonminority groups for the validation sample is not statistically significant (CR = -0.0021).

The battery is fair to blacks since the percent of both blacks and nonminorities who met the cutting scores approximated the percent who were in the high criterion group; 47% of the blacks met the cutting scores and 48% were in the high criterion group; 77% of the nonminorities met the cutting scores and 71% were in the high criterion group.

While the validity of the battery for the small subgroup of 35 males was low, the difference between the phi coefficients for the male and the female subgroups is not statistically significant (CR = 1.77).

Prior Battery

Analysts tested previously validated norms for Waitress, S-179, on this validation sample. The original battery, validated in August 1961, is N-85, M-85. This battery is valid for the total validation sample (phi = .29).

APPENDIX 1

Descriptive Statistics for Black and Nonminority Subgroups of Validation Sample

| | Black (N = 60) | | | Nonminority (N = 154) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Mean | SD | Range | Mean | SD | Range |
| Aptitude G | 84.8 | 15.2 | 56-120 | 101.2 | 17.8 | 51-140 |
| Aptitude V | 90.4 | 13.9 | 70-127 | 104.2 | 16.4 | 66-152 |
| Aptitude N | 86.9 | 15.9 | 52-127 | 99.3 | 17.6 | 48-138 |
| Aptitude S | 90.0 | 16.8 | 61-133 | 101.3 | 18.1 | 51-150 |
| Aptitude P | 103.1 | 19.4 | 50-131 | 114.2 | 21.9 | 53-163 |
| Aptitude Q | 104.7 | 13.3 | 75-133 | 117.7 | 16.8 | 72-165 |
| Aptitude K | 106.7 | 19.1 | 70-146 | 107.7 | 17.0 | 66-155 |
| Aptitude F | 91.1 | 16.0 | 49-139 | 99.6 | 22.4 | 37-153 |
| Aptitude M | 104.4 | 17.9 | 64-148 | 110.1 | 22.5 | 62-193 |
| Criterion | 43.6 | 7.8 | 30-60 | 46.1 | 7.6 | 26-60 |
| Age (Years) | 25.4 | 9.3 | 16-57 | 30.2 | 12.3 | 17-63 |
| Education (Years) | 12.4 | 1.5 | 10-17 | 12.4 | 2.0 | 8-17 |
| Total Experience (months) | 52.8 | 59.0 | 2-282 | 87.6 | 104.4 | 2-516 |

APPENDIX 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR • MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

## DESCRIPTIVE RATING SCALE

SCORE _____

RATING SCALE FOR _____

D.O.T. Title and Code

Directions: Please read the "Suggestions to Raters" and then fill in the items which follow. In making your ratings, only one box should be checked for each question.

### SUGGESTIONS TO RATERS

We are asking you to rate the job performance of the people who work for you. These ratings will serve as a "yardstick" against which we can compare the test scores in this study. The ratings must give a true picture of each worker or this study will have very little value. You should try to give the most accurate ratings possible for each worker.

These ratings are strictly confidential and won't affect your workers in any way. Neither the ratings nor test scores of any workers will be shown to anybody in your company. We are interested only in "testing the tests." Ratings are needed only for those workers who are in the test study.

Workers who have not completed their training period, or who have not been on the job or under your supervision long enough for you to know how well they can perform this work should not be rated. Please inform the test technician about this if you are asked to rate any such workers.

Complete the last question only if the worker is no longer on the job.

In making ratings, don't let general impressions or some outstanding trait affect your judgment. Try to forget your personal feelings about the worker. Rate only on the work performed. Here are some more points which might help you:

1. Please read all directions and the rating scale thoroughly before rating.

2. For each question compare your workers with "workers-in-general" in this job. That is, compare your workers with other workers on this job that you have known. This is very important in small plants where there are only a few workers. We want the ratings to be based on the same standard in all the plants.

3. A suggested method is to rate all workers on one question at a time. The questions ask about different abilities of the workers. A worker may be good in one ability and poor in another: for example, a very slow worker may be accurate. So rate all workers on the first question, then rate all workers on the second question, and so on.

4. Practice and experience usually improve a worker's skill. However, one worker with six months' experience may be a better worker than another with six years' experience. Don't rate one worker as poorer than another merely because of a lesser amount of experience.

5. Rate the workers according to the work they have done over a period of several weeks or months. Don't rate just on the basis of one "good" day, or one "bad" day or some single incident. Think in terms of each worker's usual or typical performance.

6. Rate only the abilities listed on the rating sheet. Do not let factors such as cooperativeness, ability to get along with others, promptness and honesty influence your ratings. Although these aspects of a worker are important, they are of no value for this study as a "yardstick" against which to compare aptitude test scores.

NAME OF WORKER (Print) (Last) (First)

SEX: MALE_____ FEMALE_____

Company Job Title: _____

How often do you see this worker in a work situation?

- ☐ All the time.
- ☐ Several times a day.
- ☐ Several times a week.
- ☐ Seldom.

How long have you worked with this worker?

- ☐ Under one month.
- ☐ One to two months.
- ☐ Three to five months.
- ☐ Six months or more.

A. How much can this worker get done? (Worker's ability to make efficient use of time and to work at high speed.) (If it is possible to rate only the quantity of work which a person can do on this job as adequate or inadequate, use #2 to indicate "inadequate" and #4 to indicate "adequate.")

- ☐ 1. Capable of very low work output. Can perform only at an unsatisfactory pace.
- ☐ 2. Capable of low work output. Can perform at a slow pace.
- ☐ 3. Capable of fair work output. Can perform at an acceptable pace.
- ☐ 4. Capable of high work output. Can perform at a fast pace.
- ☐ 5. Capable of very high work output. Can perform at an unusually fast pace.

B. How good is the quality of work? (Worker's ability to do high-grade work which meets quality standards.)

- ☐ 1. Performance is inferior and almost never meets minimum quality standards.
- ☐ 2. Performance is usually acceptable but somewhat inferior in quality.
- ☐ 3. Performance is acceptable but usually not superior in quality.
- ☐ 4. Performance is usually superior in quality.
- ☐ 5. Performance is almost always of the highest quality.

C. How accurate is the work? (Worker's ability to avoid making mistakes.)

- ☐ 1. Makes very many mistakes. Work needs constant checking.
- ☐ 2. Makes frequent mistakes. Work needs more checking than is desirable.
- ☐ 3. Makes mistakes occasionally. Work needs only normal checking.
- ☐ 4. Makes few mistakes. Work seldom needs checking.
- ☐ 5. Rarely makes a mistake. Work almost never needs checking.

D. How much does the worker know about the job? (Worker's understanding of the principles, equipment, materials and methods that have to do directly or indirectly with the work.)

☐ 1. Has very limited knowledge. Does not know enough to do the job adequately.

☐ 2. Has little knowledge. Knows enough to get by.

☐ 3. Has moderate amount of knowledge. Knows enough to do fair work.

☐ 4. Has broad knowledge. Knows enough to do good work.

☐ 5. Has complete knowledge. Knows the job thoroughly.

E. How large a variety of job duties can the worker perform efficiently? (Worker's ability to handle several different operations.)

☐ 1. Cannot perform different operations adequately.

☐ 2. Can perform a limited number of different operations efficiently.

☐ 3. Can perform several different operations with reasonable efficiency.

☐ 4. Can perform many different operations efficiently.

☐ 5. Can perform an unusually large variety of different operations efficiently.

F. Considering all the factors already rated, and only these factors, how good is this worker? (Worker's all-around ability to do the job.)

☐ 1. Performance usually not acceptable.

☐ 2. Performance somewhat inferior.

☐ 3. A fairly proficient worker.

☐ 4. Performance usually superior.

☐ 5. An unusually competent worker.

Complete the following ONLY if the worker is no longer on the job.

G. What do you think is the reason this person left the job? (It is not necessary to show the official reason if you feel that there is another reason, as this form will not be shown to anybody in the company.)

☐ 1. Fired because of inability to do the job.

☐ 2. Quit, and I feel that it was because of difficulty doing the job.

☐ 3. Fired or laid off for reasons other than ability to do the job (i.e., absenteeism, reduction in force).

☐ 4. Quit, and I feel the reason for quitting was not related to ability to do the job.

☐ 5. Quit or was promoted or reassigned because the worker had learned the job well and wanted to advance.

| RATED BY | TITLE | DATE |
|---|---|---|
| COMPANY OR ORGANIZATION | LOCATION (City, State, ZIP Code) | |

APPENDIX 3

JOB DESCRIPTION

Job Title S-179R82

WAITER/WAITRESS, INFORMAL (hotel & rest.) 311.477-030

Guide for Occupational Exploration (GOE) Code 09.04.01 Food Services.

Job Summary

Serves food to patrons at counters and tables of coffeeshops, lunchrooms, and other dining establishments where food service is informal.

Work Performed

Prepares for arrival of patrons: Sets assigned tables and/or counter areas with silver and dishes. Inspects tables and counters to insure all utensils, chairs, and surrounding area are clean and orderly. Studies menu to become familiar with contents and talks with manager and/or cook to determine "specials" and learn of any changes in menu.

* Takes patrons' orders: Greets patrons with menu. Serves water and coffee if requested. Takes orders for drinks before meals. Orders drinks from bar and serves them. Takes orders for food. Makes suggestions if indicated by patron. Records order in prescribed manner. Collects menus. Transmits order to cook in written or oral form.

* Serves patrons food and drink: Serves drinks, salads, soups and juices, as ordered in accordance with rules of etiquette. Carries dishes or trays of food from kitchen. Serves main course according to rules of etiquette. Responds to the needs of patrons during meal and may engage in conversation. Removes dishes and flatware after each course. Serves coffee and dessert after meal if ordered. Calculates patron's bill, adding taxes as prescribed, and directs patron to cashier, or collects payment and returns change to patron.

Cleans and arranges eating and serving areas: Keeps table supplies on hand in correct amounts. Cleans tables, buffets, serving counters and coffee makers, or directs bus person to do so.

---

* These job duties were designated as critical job duties because they must be performed competently if the job is to be performed in a satisfactory manner. Workers spend an estimated 74% of their time performing these tasks.